

DEC 1955

Ag. 3-1

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP70-00058R000100030018-8

X- Ours. Lawrence

What They Fear

CPYRIGHT

D. ZASLAVSKY

AN American observer once jokingly remarked that American businessmen greet each other not with a "How do you do?" but with "How does Dow-Jones do?" Dow-Jones is an index of the rise and fall of stock-exchange shares.

Americans are worried by signs of recession by the ups and downs of the economy. But certain elements across the ocean are alarmed by another thing—by the signs of the expansion and development of the socialist economy. Here is an illustrative example.

General Electric Co., one of the big Morgan concerns, advertise widely in the magazines. Their latest ad shows two young men; one of them a giant, the other hardly reaching his waist. The caption under the first says: Thirty-seven thousand new engineers are required in 1955, while the caption under the short man says: 21,500 new engineers were graduated in 1955. Quite a gap! The ad urges an increase in the number of technical college students and calls for donations to universities and colleges.

The drop in the number of technical-college graduates is not news. It began a few years ago but had never caused any anxiety. In 1950, American universities and colleges turned out nearly 50,000 engineers; in 1954, the number was slightly over 20,000. There are many reasons for that. The main one is that tuition fees and private endowments play the leading role in the budgets of American universities and colleges. State aid is comparatively small. Postwar inflation has swallowed up a considerable portion of the endowments. Donations have decreased. The deans of American universities could well emulate Varlaam in Pushkin's "Boris Godunov" as he mournfully exclaims:

"Badly, my sons, badly! The Christians have now turned stingy; they love their money; they hide their money. They give little to God."

Fees are high and people of modest means find it increasingly difficult to afford a university education.

In the United States that is not news either and no one paid any attention to it. Then the news broke that the Soviet Union was training more and more engineers and this more than alarmed certain elements, it almost struck panic in their hearts. The London *Economist* said in January 1955:

"American analysts are now worried lest Soviet Russia should outstrip the United States in the mass output of highly skilled technicians."

And at about the same time the Washington correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph and Morning Post* wrote that there is

"an increasing fear [in the United States] that Russia is overhauling the American lead in science and technology."

A thing like that cannot but surprise Soviet people: what's wrong with training more engineers, they ask. But then the bourgeois press has every reason to be alarmed. The growing numbers of skilled technicians testify to a rising cultural level. And conversely, stagnation in technical education and reduction in the number of specialists undergoing training indicates cultural decline. In this respect the prospects for the countries of the socialist camp are bright indeed, while those of the capitalist countries are dim.

* * *

The growth in the numbers of engineers being trained in the Soviet Union compared with the United States has so amazed the U.S. *News and World Report* that it decided to devote a major part of its September 16 issue to this question.

Its editor, David Lawrence, is known as a deadly enemy of the Soviet Union and socialism—a pigheaded and inflexible enemy, and therein lies his weakness.

For instance, for many years his magazine has been trying to convince Americans that the capitalist system is incomparably superior to socialism, that the latter is doomed to collapse, that the Soviet people can never catch up with the level of culture in America. In its attempts to please Wall Street the mag-

(CONTINUED)

azine has systematically deceived the American public. But in doing so, they have deceived themselves. That is why they are embarrassed every time facts force them to explain to readers something they had claimed was impossible.

History repeated itself in the question of higher technical education in the Soviet Union and the United States. Facts cannot be concealed. The scorn and arrogance with which the American reactionaries have spoken of Soviet science and the university system have again placed them in a ridiculous position.

The *U.S. News and World Report* published a long interview with Professor Homer Dodge and his son Norton on their return from the Soviet Union where they had spent a year familiarizing themselves with universities and the educational system. They were well received in the Soviet Union and saw all they had wanted to see.

Professor Dodge and his son confirmed that there were more students in technical colleges in the Soviet Union than in the United States. The editors of the magazine tried to console themselves by presuming that the level of education in a socialist country was lower than in a capitalist country, so they put a leading question to the Dodges. The reply, however, was anything but consoling: not lower, and in certain respects even higher.

No one can accuse Dodge the father and Dodge the son of having acquired pro-Communist sympathies and forsaken their bourgeois beliefs. No, even after their stay in the Soviet Union the Dodges remained faithful to their political and philosophical views, but they spoke with respect of the Soviet people although they saw things they did not like and criticized, for instance, our housebuilding.

The magazine then tried another bait. How does higher education affect Soviet young men and women? Don't they become less reliable and don't they oppose the socialist system? But these questions too, strange as they may seem to any more or less sober-minded person, did not bring the replies the editors expected. The Dodges proved disappointing. No, they said, university graduates do not turn away from communism. On the contrary, Soviet students are utterly devoted to communism. Yes, they are all "indoctrinated" with Marxism-Leninism and are absolutely sincere. The Dod-

ges appeared slightly disappointed about this, but a fact is a fact. Higher education, and theoretical education generally, does not run counter to the socialist outlook, in fact, it fully accords with it.

And so it turned out that one of the most reactionary American magazines, perhaps for the first time, gave a positive picture of Soviet life. That, of course, is very good. Unfortunately, however, it does not mean that the magazine has decided to forsake cold war methods. On the contrary, David Lawrence remains one of its most ardent exponents. He featured the Dodge interview with the express purpose of alarming the American moneybags: see how dangerous the Soviet Union is: it trains considerably more young engineers than the United States! To arms, gentlemen!

The editors of the *U.S. News* were well aware that the picture of peaceful progress in the Soviet Union would impress the public at large differently and would lead them to different conclusions. For that reason they came out with an "antidote"—an article by such an authority on education as Allen Dulles, director of the United States Central Intelligence Agency. To counterbalance the Dodge interview, the magazine published excerpts from Allen Dulles's address to Columbia University students in June.

Now Allen Dulles is not a novice in certain aspects of education: he directs a network of espionage schools in Western Europe. But one must agree that this is not sufficient to enable him to judge higher education in the Soviet Union, or in any other country. But then David Lawrence and his friends were not at all disturbed by that. Allen Dulles's article appeared under the sensational headline: "Education in Russia May Defeat Communists."

Why?

The answer is too ridiculous for words. Allen Dulles does not trust educated people either in the United States or in the Soviet Union. To him education is a plague. So he warns the Soviet people: If you want to exist longer, reduce the number of educated people.

After that, one would think that Allen Dulles, as an enemy of communism, should be glad that the number of educated people is growing in the Soviet Union. Yet he is alarmed. He is panic-stricken by every

CPYRGHT

achievement in socialist construction, by every victory won by communism.

The article is full of trash. Here is one of the gems of his police wisdom. Marxism, he says, has not justified itself in agriculture because "Marx was not much of a farmer." It was because of this that the Soviet people turned away from Marx and went to study farming methods... in Iowa.

Allen Dulles cannot be called naive. He is rather one of those who, while lacking a sense of humour, possess the gift of making their readers and listeners laugh.

One would think that Allen Dulles should wait patiently for educated people in the Soviet Union to "defeat socialism." He is too impatient, however. His espionage schools devote quite a bit of time to anti-Communist studies. Some of the would-be overthrowers of communism graduating from these schools broadcast over the Voice of America.

This is what one of them said on October 16:

"If, as Engels says, dialectic philosophy sees the sign of inevitable decline on everything and in everything then it is obvious that Communist rule will fall as a result, as Engels says, of constant emergence and destruction..."

We would like to ask this orator where Engels said that and when, and whether he knew who Engels was.

The reply would probably be: "Oh, lay off! We haven't studied that."

It is significant that the enemies of communism can no longer ignore the theory and practice of socialist construction. They tried to do so and failed. But the weapon with which the "deniers" of Marxism have now armed themselves is no better. It is the old ideological cudgel of the remote past. Certain leading American reactionaries, it seems, are beginning to understand this and perhaps that is why David Lawrence and Allen Dulles are so afraid of the development of higher education in the Soviet Union.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT
SELLING THE MOON

Would you like to buy a piece of the moon? If you don't think it's a hoax, apply to Mr. Robert Coles, founder and president of the Interplanetary Development Corporation. Address: Glen Cove, Long Island, New York. The company has already found 4,500 buyers.

In return for one dollar Mr. Coles will sell you a deed for a one-acre plot. And you won't have to scour the planet to find your property. Mr. Coles gives its exact location: the land lies in the Copernicus crater in the moon's north-east quadrant.

The buyer also receives the hunting, fishing and winter sports rights near his plot. In addition, he is given a brochure describing the beauties of the moon, and a map that enables the purchaser to find and admire his lunar estate through a telescope. The buyer, then, might feel quite assured that he had made a wonderful acquisition—if it were not for one

serious defect: Interplanetary Development Corporation does not, so far, provide transportation to the moon.

We have not invented all this; it has been the talk of the world press. Mr. Coles, former chairman of a planetarium in New York, is reported to have filed with the City Clerk at Glen Cove, Long Island, a claim for the entire moon. He explained to the perplexed official that he had made a long study of the moon and that he intended to go there soon as a member of an interplanetary expedition. No one had claimed land rights on the moon before, so he was doing so now.

But it appears that another lunar realtor had got in before him. Mr. Harry Hall, Florida, came forward and declared that he had filed his claim long before Coles and was selling plots at a much cheaper rate.

That Coles and Hall have decided to grab the moon and sell it piecemeal—and have even found buyers in the United States—is of